

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

NEVIN SHETTY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:23-cr-00084-TL

ORDER ON DEFENDANT’S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Nevin Shetty’s Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief. Dkt. No. 89. Having considered Defendant’s motion and the Government’s opposition (Dkt. No. 90), and finding oral argument unnecessary, the Court GRANTS Defendant’s motion.

Mr. Shetty has requested permission to file a “Supplemental Brief Regarding Corporate Law in Support of Pending Motions.” Dkt. No. 89 at 1. He does not cite to any rule permitting him to request such a filing, but states that due to briefing limits, he “has not been able to address

1 many of the relevant corporate law issues at sufficient length.” *Id.* However, as the Government  
2 notes in its Opposition to Mr. Shetty’s motion, two of Mr. Shetty’s briefs pertaining to the four  
3 pending motions were well under the briefing limits. Dkt. No. 90 at 2; *see also* Dkt. Nos. 52, 73.  
4 Additionally, Mr. Shetty could have (but did not) sought the Court’s approval for an overlength  
5 brief in order to address these corporate law issues in connection with briefing on any of the four  
6 pending motions.


7       Nevertheless, in the interest of ensuring that Mr. Shetty has a meaningful opportunity to  
8 present a complete defense, the Court will permit Mr. Shetty to file his supplemental brief  
9 regarding corporate law. *See Holmes v. South Carolina*, 547 U.S. 319, 324, 126 S.Ct. 1727  
10 (2006) (“Whether rooted directly in the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment or in  
11 the Compulsory Process or Confrontation Clauses of the Sixth Amendment, the Constitution  
12 guarantees criminal defendants ‘a meaningful opportunity to present a complete defense.’”  
13 (quoting *Crane v. Kentucky*, 476 U.S. 683, 690, 106 S.Ct. 2142 (1986)). However, the Court  
14 cautions Mr. Shetty that future requests for piecemeal, belated litigation will be considered  
15 waived and denied.

16       Accordingly, the Court ORDERS as follows:

- 17       1. The Court GRANTS Mr. Shetty’s Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Brief.  
18       Dkt. No. 89. Mr. Shetty is ORDERED to file his Supplemental Brief Regarding  
19       Corporate Law by no later than August 19, 2024.
- 20       2. The Government is ORDERED to file any responsive briefing by no later than  
21       September 3, 2024.
- 22       3. No reply will be permitted.
- 23       4. The following motions are re-noted to September 3, 2024: Defendant’s Motion to  
24       Suppress (Dkt. No. 41); Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 52);

Government's Motion to Exclude Expert Testimony (Dkt. No. 58); Defendant's  
Motion to Compel *Brady* Materials (Dkt. No. 73).

Dated this 16th day of August 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tana Lin  
United States District Judge